DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 211 FL 016 529

TITLE Computer Focused Russian Bilingual Instruction Program, 1985-1986. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE [87]
GRANT 003BH40141
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; Career Awareness; *Computer Assisted Instruction; Computer Literacy; Computer Software; Correlation; *English (Second Language); High Schools; High School Students; Language Skills; Limited English Speaking; *Native Language Instruction; Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Qualitative Research; *Russian; Secondary Education; Second Language Instruction; Statistical Analysis; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS Content Area Teaching

ABSTRACT

A New York City program to develop English-language skills, academic skills, native language skills, computer literacy, and career awareness among 250 limited-English-proficient native speakers of Russian in 6 high schools is evaluated in this report. The program was run in both public and private high schools. Quantitative analysis of student achievement data indicates that program objectives were met in English language skills and computer literacy, and content-area achievement was high in comparison to citywide averages, but native language achievement did not meet the program objective. Recommendations for program improvement are to provide students with more computer experience, make computer programs more suitable to the Russian bilingual students' needs, and review and revise program objectives based on students' actual ability to perform. The appendices include statistical analyses of student test scores. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

O.E.A. Evaluation Section Report

Robert Tobias, Administrator of Evaluation
Judith S. Torres, Senior Manager

Grant Number: 003BH40141

COMPUTER FOCUSED RUSSIAN

BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

1985-1986

Project Director:
Florence Seiman

Prepared by the
O.E.A. Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit
Armando Cotayo, Evaluation Manager
Jose J. Villegas, Evaluation/Planning Specialist
Shelley M. Fischer, Evaluation/Planning Specialist
Margaret H. Scorza, Editorial/Production Coordinator
Ana Martinez, Evaluation Consultant
Alla Klimov, Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

A SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

The primary objective of the Computer Focused Russian Bilingual Instructional Program -- which has completed its initial year of funding -- is the development of English-language skills among 250 high school students of limited English proficiency (LEP) via academic, computer, and career instruction. An ancillary objective is to help students make well-informed educational and career choices. The students were all foreign-born, with Russian as their native language. Their English-language proficiency, native language ability, and overall academic skills varied. Instruction took place at two private and four public high schools in Brooklyn.

The project director was headquartered at a central office located in South Shore High School. She regularly visited each site. A resource teacher, a community outreach worker, a secretary, and a curriculum specialist/grade advisor constituted the rest of the central office staff. All of the members of the central office staff were employed full-time and paid with Title VII funds. At each public school, the project operated under the aegis of the foreign language department, which was headed by an assistant principal. Project activities at the two private schools were implemented by one educational assistant provided by the project.

The content of the instructional program varied. At the public schools, students attended courses in English as a second language, (E.S.L.), native language arts, and content-area subjects in English. The classes were designed to develop computer know-how through the use of the computer as a tool for learning English and academic subjects. At the two private schools, the instructional program consisted of tutorial support and small-group instruction. Career awareness was developed through regular sessions with the career counselor, presentations by guest speakers representing various occupations, and visits to a variety of workplaces.

Staff development activities consisted of monthly meetings at the central office, site visits by the project director and the community outreach worker, attendance at conferences and workshops on bilingual education, and participation in university courses. Parental involvement included individual meetings with project staff to discuss their children's progress, monthly workshops, and a Parents' Advisory Council.

The Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test (CREST) was used to assess English-language devlopment; teacher-made examinations were used to assess native-language development; and school and program records provided data on attendance.

Quantitative analysis of student achievement data indicated that:

-- Over 80 percent of the program students tested with the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test made gains of one or more objectives per month of instruction. The objective was met.

-- Overall, students' achievement in the content areas was high when compared to citywide averages. However, mainstream achievement

data were not available to assess the objective.

-- The program objective was met by students in computer literacy/keyboarding classes, who achieved an overall passing rate of 75 percent.

-- Students in native language arts classes did not meet the high criterion levels set by the program. This suggests that the passing criterion (a minimum of 80 percent of the students achieving a 75 percent or higher rate of passing) set in the proposal was unrealistic.

The following recommendations are offered as possible program improvements:

-- providing the students with more opportunities for hands-on computer experience;

-- making computer programs more suitable to the Russian bilingual students' needs;

-- reviewing program objectives and revising them as necessary. The criteria set for achievement should be based on students' actual ability to perform.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this report, as of all Office of Educational Assessment/Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit reports, is the result of a cooperative effort of regular staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the cover, Eulalia Cabrera has interpreted findings and has integrated material into reports. Arthur Lopatin has edited the reports following the O.E.A. style guide and has written report summaries. Finally, Joseph Rivera, Marcia Gilbert, Bruce Roach, and Martin Zurla have worked intensively as word processors to produce and correct reports. Without their able and faithful participation, the unit could not have handled such a large volume of work and still produced quality evaluation reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	OVERVIEW	1
II.	STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS	3
III.	FINDINGS: INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT	8
	English as a Second Language	8
	Bilingual Computer Skills Classes	12
	Bilingual Instruction in Academic Subjects	14
	Enrichment of Native-Language Skills	16
IV.	FINDINGS: NON-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT	18
	The Affective Domain: Student Needs	18
	Attendance	21
	Parental Involvement	21
	Curriculum Development	22
	Staff Development	22
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	24
VI.	APPENDICES	28

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1:	Number and Percent of Program Students by Language and Country of Birth.	4
TABLE 2:	Number of Program Students by Sex and Grade.	5
TABLE 3:	Number of Program Students by Age and Grade.	6
TABLE 4:	Time Spent in the Bilingual Program.	7
TABLE 5:	Results of the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test.	11
TABLE 6:	Passing Rates for Computer Literacy.	13
TABLE 7:	Passing Rates for Content Areas.	15
TABLE 8:	Passing Rates for Native Language Arts Courses.	17

COMPUTER FOCUSED RUSSIAN BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Year of Operation:	1985-86, First Year of Operation
Target Language:	Russian
Number of Participants:	250 Students
Central Office Location:	South Shore High School 6565 Flatlands Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11236
Public School Sites:	South Shore High School 6565 Flatlands Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11236 Franklin D. Roosevelt High School 5800 Twentieth Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11204 Abraham Lincoln High School Ocean Parkway and West Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11235 James Madison High School 3787 Bedford Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11229
Private School Sites:	Yeshiva Harama 2600 Ocean Avenue Brooklyn, New York Yeshiva Be'er Hagola 293 Neptune Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11235
Project Director:	Florence Seiman

I. OVERVIEW

The Computer Focused Russian Bilingual Instructional Program is in its first year of funding (1985-86). The project seeks to develop the English language skills of 250 students of limited English proficiency (LEP) through a program of academic, computer, and career instruction. Four public and two private high schools participated in the program. The public high schools were South Shore H.S., Franklin D. Roosevelt (F.D.R.)

H.S., Abraham Lincoln H.S., and James Madison H.S. The private high schools were Yeshiva Harama and Yeshiva Be'er Hagola.

The Title VII project director and secretary were headquartered at South Shore High School. Other centrally-based Title VII staff included a resource teacher, a curriculum specialist/grade advisor, and a community outreach worker.

All program students received instruction in English as a second language (E.S.L.) and computer skills, and participated in bilingual small-group tutorials in science and social studies. Because no bilingual mathematics classes were offered, project staff were available to provide tutorial assistance as needed. Finally, public school students were enrolled in native language arts courses.

II. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Whereas most participants taking part in previous bilingual programs for Russian-speaking students had arrived directly from the U.S.S.R., the bulk of the participants in the 1985-86 Computer Focused Russian Bilingual Instructional Program had already spent one or more years in an American public high school or transferred from yeshivas where most of their time had been spent learning Hebrew. Other students were recent arrivals from Israel. Tables 2, 3, and 4 provide detailed information on the program students by sex and grade, age and grade, and time spent in the program, respectively.

About 50 percent of the target population were classified as LEP, having scored below the twenty-first percentile on the English-language version of the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) and having experienced difficulty with all-English instruction. According to the program staff, although the remaining students had a working knowledge of English, they had academic problems that stemmed from the psychological difficulty of adjusting to a new cultural environment. And, compared with previous Russian bilingual programs, an increasing number of students were illiterate in their native language, or were losing literacy skills faster than the program could reinforce them.

Of the 247 students for whom information was reported, 236 were born in the U.S.S.R., seven were born in Poland, and four were born in Hungary. Table 1 presents the program students by native language and country of birth.

TABLE 1

Number and Percent of Program
Students by Language and Country of Birth

Language	Country of Birth	Number	Percent
Russian	U.S.S.R.	236	96
Other European	Poland	7	3
	Hungary	4	2
TOTAL		247	100

- The majority (96 percent) of program students were born in the U.S.S.R. They are native speakers of Russian.
- Four percent of the students are from Poland and Hungary. They speak other European languages.

COMPUTER FOCUSED RUSSIAN

BILINGUAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

1985-1986

OEA Evaluation Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Gutlenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Program Students by Sex and Grade

Grade	Number Male Students	Percent of Grade	Number Female Students	Percent of Grade	Total Number	Percent of All Students
9	27	38	44	62	71	29
10	30	44	38	56	68	28
11	11	28	29	73	40	16
12	24	35	44	65	68	28
TOTAL	92	37[a]	155	63[a]	247[b]	100

[a] Percent of program students.

[b] Data are missing for 12 ninth graders, 4 tenth graders, 9 eleventh graders, and 9 twelfth graders.

- The majority of program students (63 percent) are female. Female students outnumber males in all grades.
- The distribution of students by grade is fairly even.

TABLE 3

Number of Program Students by Age and Grade[a]

Age	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	Total
13	2	0	0	0	2
14	24	3	0	0	27
15	25	29	1	0	55
16	13	23	18	12	66
17	2	7	16	26	51
18	1	1	4	25	31
19	0	0	0	0	0
20	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	67	63	39	64	233
Overage Students					
Number	16	8	4	1	29
Percent	24	10	7	less than 1	12

Note. Shaded boxes indicate expected age range for grade.

[a] Based on fall data only.

- The highest percentage of overage students is in grade nine (25 percent).
- Overall, the program has low numbers of overage students, with the lowest proportions (less than one percent) in grade twelve.

TABLE 4

Time Spent in the Bilingual Program*
(As of June 1986)

Time Spent in Bilingual Program	Number of Students				
	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	Total
<1 Academic Year	37	21	17	40	115
1 Academic Year	33	46	20	25	124
2 Academic Years	1	1			2
TOTAL	71	68	37	65	241

*Rounded to the nearest year.
**Reflects participation in a previous bilingual program.

- The majority of the students (124, or 51 percent) have been in the program for one year.
- One hundred and fifteen students (48 percent) have been in the program one year or less.

III. FINDINGS: INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

Evaluation findings are presented by proposed program objective and are based on the results of student performance in courses and tests, reviews of program materials and records, interviews with program staff, and classroom observations.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

-- During the first year of the project, a minimum of 80 percent of the students participating in the program will master an average of one objective per twenty days of instruction as measured by the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test (CREST).

According to project staff, English as a second language (E.S.L.) instruction was available at each of the six sites. Some students qualified for E.S.L. instruction by scoring below the twenty-first percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB). The other students had more advanced English-language skills, but according to project staff they continued to have difficulty in their academic work.

Public school students who were enrolled in mainstream English classes received individual or small-group assistance from program staff. Those enrolled at the private schools received tutorial assistance in E.S.L. and English reading from the paraprofessionals assigned to those sites.

The program director remarked that the need to reinforce English skills was greater than indicated by LAB results. She said that students often cleared the LAB cutoff but in reality lacked the skills needed to function effectively in mainstream classes. Although they could answer questions on the LAB, their English was not good enough to enable them to perform well in academic courses. And since their parents usually knew less English than their children, they could get no parental help with

their English. For this reason, the program emphasized small-group tutorials for both those students who qualified for E.S.L. and those who "tested out" on the LAB.

Student Achievement in E.S.L.

The assessment instrument used to evaluate this objective was the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test* (CREST). The CREST was developed by the New York City Public Schools to measure mastery of the syntactical skills presented in the E.S.L. curriculum. The CREST uses four items to measure each skill, and mastery is achieved when three of the four items are answered correctly. The test has three levels: beginning (1), intermediate (2), and advanced (3). Levels 1 and 2 each measure mastery of 25 skills, while level 3 measures mastery of 15 skills.

The CREST was administered at the beginning of each semester. A mastery score to indicate gains was computed for each student by calculating the difference between pretest and posttest. The number of months of instruction between testings was computed for each student by multiplying the number of months between testings by the student's attendance rate. The number of skills mastered per month was calculated by dividing the mean mastery by the mean number of months of instruction between testings.

Table 5 presents the test results for students who were pretested and posttested with the same level. Of the students who were reported to be

*Extensive information on CREST syntactical skills and psychometric properties are in the Technical Manual, New York City English as a Second Language Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test. Board of Education of the City of New York, Division of High Schools, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201.

taking E.S.L. classes (levels 1, 2, and 3), complete data (levels, pretest score, and posttest score) were available for 100 percent in the fall and 88.2 percent in the spring.

Examination of Table 5 reveals that overall, students gained 1.6 CREST objectives in the fall, and 1.3 CREST objectives in the spring. Eighty-eight percent of the students tested achieved one or more objective per month of instruction, thus meeting the program objective. Additional information for individual schools is in Appendix A.

Students tested at level 3 had lower performance rates than those tested at lower levels, partly because fewer skills are tested at that level and partly because mastery of objectives takes longer at that level. The program objective appears to be based on the assumption that progress across levels is linear; the lower achievement at level 3, which is found frequently in other bilingual high school programs, suggests that it is not.

TABLE 5

Results of the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test
(Program Students Pretested in the Fall and
Posttested in the Spring)

Test Level	Number of Students	PRETEST Mean	PRETEST S.D.	POSTTEST Mean	POSTTEST S.D.	MASTERY Mean	MASTERY S.D.	Mean Mastery Per Month
				FALL				
1	15	11.3	5.7	16.2	4.8	4.9	3.8	1.9
2	77	15.5	4.9	21.0	3.1	5.5	4.1	2.1
3	92	9.5	4.1	12.3	2.1	2.8	2.6	1.1
TOTAL	184	12.2	5.4	16.2	5.1	4.1	3.6	1.6
				SPRING				
1	12	14.9	5.0	21.3	4.9	6.4	.8	3.4
2	33	15.4	5.4	22.2	4.2	6.8	1.9	3.4
3	104	8.8	4.1	13.1	2.2	4.3	4.3	2.2
TOTAL	149	10.7	5.4	15.8	5.1	5.0	2.5	1.3

- The program objective was surpassed in both semesters. On the average, students mastered more than one CREST objective per month of instruction.

BILINGUAL COMPUTER SKILLS CLASSES

-- By the conclusion of the first year of the program, a minimum of 75 percent of the students participating in the program will be able to perform the following tasks relating to computer literacy/keyboarding:

- Elementary programming skills in BASIC language.
- Touch keyboarding using the alphabetic, numeric, and symbol keyboard.
- Type at least 25 w.p.m. with a high degree of accuracy on a personal computer keyboard.

The program staff reported that bilingual computer skills classes were offered at all six sites. These classes stressed the idea that good language skills are needed for success in business. Topics covered in these classes included specialized terms, the language and format of business correspondence, and the applications, forms, and documents that are necessary for employment. Whenever possible, computers were made available for students to use during their free periods.

The program staff utilized existing curricula and software, and also developed transitional materials, which made partial use of the students' native language, for the computer science and the literacy courses.

Bilingual staff provided tutorial assistance and encouraged peer tutoring by more advanced students. The Russian bilingual teacher provided support services for students by translating technical vocabulary into Russian.

Student Achievement in Computer Skills

The instruments used to assess these objectives were teacher-developed tests on computer literacy, keyboard/typing, and typing courses.

Table 6 presents the number of students enrolled and the percentage

passing these courses in the fall and spring. Overall, the objectives were surpassed: More than 75 percent of the students were able to perform the required tasks. Results for individual schools are in Appendix B.

TABLE 6

Passing Rates for Computer Literacy

	FALL		SPRING		TOTAL
Content Area	Number of Students	Percent Passing	Number of Students	Percent Passing	Overall Passing Rate
Computer Literacy*	91	100.0	154	99.3	96.5

*Includes computer literacy, keyboard/typing, and typing courses.

- The program's objectives were surpassed in both semesters: More than 75 percent of the participating students were able to perform the required tasks related to computer literacy/keyboarding.

BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION IN ACADEMIC SUBJECT AREAS

-- By the conclusion of the first year of the project, the percentage of students participating in the program achieving a 65 percent or higher rating in academic subject classes will be at least equal to the percentage of mainstream students achieving a 65 percent or higher rating in the same academic subjects.

According to program staff members, students had strong mathematics skills and were able to learn effectively in mainstream classes. However, staff members were available for tutorial assistance when needed. Small-group tutorials in bilingual science and social studies were conducted at all six sites.

Student Achievement in Academic Subject Areas

Data on mainstream students were not available to assess this objective. However, Table 7 illustrates program students' performance in content areas for descriptive purposes. Overall, program students' achievement was very high (93 percent passing rate). Achievement was highest in business/vocational courses, with a 97.3 percent passing rate in the fall, and a 96.7 percent passing rate in the spring.

TABLE 7

Passing Rates for Content Areas

Content Area	FALL Number of Students	FALL Percent Passing	SPRING Number of Students	SPRING Percent Passing	TOTAL Overall Passing Rate
Math	219	91.3	204	90.7	91.0
Science	253	93.3	237	91.1	92.2
Social Studies	214	91.6	238	93.3	92.5
Business/ Vocational	149	97.3	212	96.7	96.9
TOTALS		93.0		92.9	93.0

- Passing rates for program students were high (93.0 percent).

ENRICHMENT OF NATIVE LANGUAGE SKILLS

-- By the conclusion of the first year of the project, a minimum of 80 percent of the students participating in the project will achieve a 75 percent or higher rating in the Native Language Arts component of the program.

Program staff provided Russian-language instruction at the public school sites. Russian-language instruction was available on a tutorial basis at the two private schools.

Staff members noted that structuring a coherent native-language curriculum is difficult, because Russian-speaking students enter high school with such diverse native language skills. Recent immigrants have strong native-language skills, and are capable of discussing difficult literary texts in Russian with a fair level of sophistication. On the other hand, those who immigrated as young children, and those who came to the United States after lengthy stays in Europe or Israel, have strong oral skills but read and write poorly. To deal with this situation, teachers met with students in small groups. In some cases, peer counseling was available to Russian-speaking students through extracurricular Russian-language clubs.

Student Achievement in Native Language Skills

Examination of Table 8 reveals that the program objective was not met. Overall, only 70 percent of the students achieved the passing criterion of 75 percent. This passing criterion, however, is much higher than the citywide standard passing criterion (65 percent) used in New York City high schools. Had the standard passing criterion been used, the objective would have been met (100 percent of the students would have passed in the fall, and 97.6 percent in the spring). It is recommended that this objective be

revised, and a criterion be set that reflects students actual ability to perform in native language arts.

TABLE 8

Percent of Students in Native Language Arts Courses Meeting the Program Criterion

	FALL		SPRING		TOTAL
Content Area	Number of Students	Percent Meeting Criterion	Number of Students	Percent Meeting Criterion	Overall Mastery Rate
Russian	102	63.7	125	73.6	69.2

IV. FINDINGS: NON-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

THE AFFECTIVE DOMAIN: STUDENT NEEDS

-- By the conclusion of the first year of the project, a minimum of 80 percent of the students participating in the program will have developed a more positive attitude about school and its importance for their future lives.

The project director and curriculum specialist stressed that immigrants from the Soviet Union generally have greater difficulty in making an emotional adjustment to life in the United States than in handling new academic tasks. Academic difficulties, poor attendance, and departures from school can often be traced to emotional trauma rather than to educational deficits. They noted that the immigration process has often disrupted family relations. Parents often are bogged down by financial and employment worries, and by a pattern of downward mobility that wreaks havoc on their self-esteem. As a result, the students' home environments are often places of confusion, stress, and turmoil.

The project director and the curriculum specialist pointed out that in the Soviet Union students had few decisions to make about their educational program, post-graduation plans, and extracurricular activities. In the United States, they are confronted with an array of choices about their educational future, including financial aid and loans. Lacking any experience in the American educational system, students' parents are even more confused by these options and cannot provide realistic advice.

For these reasons, in its constellation of non-instructional services, the program emphasized psychological counseling, vocational and college advisement, and tutorial assistance.

Psychological Counseling

A Russian-speaking counselor working with the Russian Adolescent Project (RAP) was available to work with program students about once a month, and as needed. A staff member in a previous Russian bilingual program, he had subsequently enrolled in a doctoral program in psychology and was in the process of completing his Ph.D. The counselor worked on an individual or small-group basis with those students who were identified by the program staff as being most in need of support. As a bilingual counselor with experience in both cultures and educational systems, he was able to anticipate and respond to students' concerns.

College/Vocational Advisement

The curriculum specialist devoted a great deal of attention to this aspect of the program. Students were very dependent upon this advice because their parents could not help them. Helping students set realistic educational goals was a primary concern, since most program students wanted to go on to college. Some wanted to apply only to Ivy League colleges because these were the only ones whose names they knew, or whose names their parents knew. The resource specialist acquainted students and their parents with other colleges.

Other students set their sights too low. Despite demonstrated ability, they were determined to drive a cab or sell electronics; in short, to jump quickly into the job market. The curriculum specialist advised them that the only educational alternative to full-time study is many years in evening school.

Part of the career/computer advisement component of the program is a guest-speaker series. Representatives from various educational

institutions addressed students, and project staff helped students to formulate and pose questions. Russian-speaking professionals were also invited. Appendix C lists the speakers who appeared at program sites.

Tutorial Assistance

Tutorial assistance was the backbone of the program. Students had widely varying linguistic and academic skills, based on differing patterns of immigration and the differing points at which their academic careers had been interrupted. This fact, combined with emotional problems rooted in the difficulty of adjusting to a radically different social and educational setting, was best addressed with one-to-one or small-group attention. Staff members said that Russian-speaking students who had emigrated twice (first to Israel, where learning Hebrew occupied a great part of their academic program) were in particular need of tutoring.

This type of educational support was available at all six sites. Peer tutoring was also available.

Extracurricular Activities

Program staff members planned activities intended to help students orient themselves to their new cultural environment while at the same time retaining a connection to their own cultural roots. Activities included:

- Movies and plays: students saw the film The Jazzman and the plays Moskva and Romeo and Juliet.
- Field trips: students visited the New York Stock Exchange.
- College visits: students visited Brooklyn College, Frick College, Kingsborough Community College, and Hunter College.

Students also took part in other extracurricular activities. A number of students from F.D.R. worked as volunteers at Maimonides Hospital, in

Brooklyn. F.D.R. students also took part in a music festival, and Russian-speaking students at Yeshiva Harama organized a Russian ensemble.

Program staff members promoted integration of program participants into the larger student body by encouraging them to take part in schoolwide activities. Although the process of social integration was slow, male students frequently joined sports teams, usually soccer. One group of program students volunteered to assist a group of Madison High School students who had undertaken a two-month independent study project on Russian culture.

ATTENDANCE

Program students had good attendance records and were developing positive attitudes toward school. Staff members believed that the key to good attendance was the attention paid to the affective domain through the program's emphasis on support services.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

-- By the conclusion of the first year of the project, a series of E.S.L. classes for parents of LEP students in the project will have been given at four of the target sites.

-- By the conclusion of the first year of the project, a minimum of seven workshops (one at each of the identified sites) will have been conducted by project staff to inform parents about the project and specifically the computer instruction component of the project.

Helping parents to help their children was a continuing priority of program staff. The staff valued its rapport with parents and encouraged them to come to school (or to telephone) if they had questions or problems, or if they simply wanted to become better acquainted with the American educational system. A Parents' Advisory Council held two scheduled meetings, and additional ones were called on an as-needed basis. The

project provided parents with opportunities to take evening E.S.L. courses. The classes were held at Temple Emanu-El, at 1880 Rockaway Parkway in Brooklyn. Some parents came to the presentations on various careers that were held for students. Several workshops were held to inform parents about the project, specifically its computer-instruction component.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

-- By the conclusion of the first year of the project, an outline of the curriculum for computer literacy/keyboarding, which will integrate Russian language instructions into computer skills activities, will have been prepared.

Curriculum development is an ongoing concern. The program makes use of the many materials that were prepared by previous Russian bilingual programs in New York City. In addition, the project staff is developing curricula in career education, practical biology, hygiene, economics, and business education, and is organizing and enlarging library resources. The curriculum specialist acquired numerous books in English and Russian that are relevant to the project's career component.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Program staff met monthly for staff development workshops. (See Appendix D.) In addition, key staff members met twice with members of the Office of Bilingual Education (O.B.E.) staff, and the project director met monthly with the staff of the Division of High Schools.

Program staff members also attended the following off-site staff development activities:

- Bilingual Education Multifunctional Support Center, Hunter College Center;
- U.N. Week on Foreign Languages;
- O.B.E. Title VII Workshop;
- SABE Conference in Albany, N.Y.;

- Economics Conference at Brooklyn College;
- Bilingual Education Conference at St. John's University;
- Bilingual Education Conference, State Education Department offices, Albany, N.Y.; and
- TESOL Conference at Anaheim, California.

In addition, four staff members continued their education at local universities. One resource teacher took "Education Seminar and Methodology" at Brooklyn College; another resource teacher took a "Seminar on Media Criticism" at New York University. One paraprofessional took a course at Hunter College -- "Russia from Past to Present;" the project secretary took "Intermediate Stenography-Pitman" at Kingsborough Community College.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

In its first year of operation, the Computer Focused Bilingual Instructional Program served 250 Russian-speaking students at four public and two private high schools in New York City. Although the program was only in its first year of operation, it was able to build upon the foundation created by previous Russian bilingual programs that operated in New York City. For this reason, the program had the advantage of starting with a seasoned staff, a substantial body of curricular materials, and a great deal of experience in dealing with adolescent immigrants from the Soviet Union.

The participants differed from students enrolled in previous Russian bilingual programs. The significant reduction in emigration from the Soviet Union meant that far fewer students entered the program directly from Soviet high schools. New entrants generally had spent more time in schools in the United States, Europe, or Israel. In comparison with participants in previous programs, they had stronger oral skills in English, but weaker literacy skills in Russian. Although they were more likely to surpass the LAB cutoff in English, they continued to have academic difficulties stemming from disruptions in their education at crucial stages, and from the psychological problems of adjusting to a new culture. As the project director stressed, many students who tested well on the LAB were not able to absorb English-language academic material. Students who had spent a substantial time in Israel before coming to the United States tended to lag behind their peers academically, since they had concentrated on learning Hebrew rather than English or content-area subjects. Two

on learning Hebrew rather than English or content-area subjects. Two particular challenges facing the program were to meet its students' varying needs and to prepare them to enter the job market or continue their education.

It can be stated that the program was well implemented. Except for one new member, the program staff was highly experienced, having worked in previous Russian bilingual programs at the same sites. The range of services remained constant throughout the year. The project continually stressed career development in its computer component, and the curriculum specialist arranged a schedule of guest speakers from a wide range of careers and institutions.

Highlights of program implementation were as follows:

- A Russian-speaking psychologist visited project sites about once a month and as needed to help students with problems of adjustment.
- Program students participated in greater numbers in mainstream computer classes, where they received support from a bilingual teacher.
- Staff members made strides in their own professional development, completing (or nearing the completion of) graduate degrees.
- The project's library continued to be expanded and organized.
- The curricula expanded and work was proceeding on long-term curriculum development projects.

The staff deserve special recognition for the supportive services they provided to students and for their work with parents. The post-graduation plans reported by the program's students -- most of whom intended to go on to four-year colleges -- speak well for the program's career awareness and college advisement components.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the Computer Focused Bilingual Program was fully developed in the yeshivas, in the public high schools the Russian students were in the mainstream computer program. The Russian bilingual teacher provided support services for students by translating technical vocabulary into Russian. To improve the program, the evaluation team recommends that students be given more opportunities for hands-on computer experience, and that computer programs be reviewed to determine their adequacy for the Russian bilingual students' needs.

In summary, the Computer Focused Russian Bilingual Instructional Program is well accepted and welcomed by each participating school. The students in the program seem to have a positive attitude toward school in general, and toward instruction in Russian and the bilingual staff in particular. The program's curriculum specialist/grade adviser works closely with guidance counselors at each site. Trips were arranged to Hunter College, Kingsborough Community College, Brooklyn College and various business sites in order to acquaint the students with opportunities for post-high school education.

The program had an extensive Russian library to help students enrich their proficiency in Russian language and literature. It also stimulated parental involvement by allowing them to browse through the collection whenever they visited their child's school.

Since some students found it difficult to adjust to the American school system and language, the program employed a Russian-speaking psychologist who was very skillful in helping students adjust to their new

environment.

Since the program did not meet its native language achievement objective, it might review this objective and revise it as necessary. The criteria set for achievement should be based on students' actual ability to perform.

All in all, this is an excellent program run by staff members who play a major role in helping these youngsters develop into competent and productive Americans.

VI. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Results of the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test
Be'er Hagola

Test Level	Number of Students	PRETEST Mean	PRETEST S.D.	POSTTEST Mean	POSTTEST S.D.	MASTERY Mean	MASTERY S.D.	Mean Mastery Per Month
				FALL				
1	5	8.4	7.4	15.0	6.2	6.6	5.8	4.1
2	21	15.4	6.0	21.7	3.0	6.3	5.8	3.1
3	14	12.1	2.8	12.8	1.0	0.7	2.2	0.4
TOTAL	40	13.4	5.7	17.8	5.2	4.4	5.5	2.3
				SPRING				
1	4	15.5	5.2	22.0	4.8	6.5	0.6	4.0
2	4	14.2	8.2	21.0	7.3	6.7	0.9	3.3
3	18	10.7	4.4	13.4	2.5	2.7	2.0	1.4
TOTAL	26	12.0	5.3	15.9	5.3	3.9	2.5	2.0

APPENDIX A

Results of the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test
Harama

Test Level	Number of Students	PRETEST Mean	PRETEST S.D.	POSTTEST Mean	POSTTEST S.D.	MASTERY Mean	MASTERY S.D.	Mean Mastery Per Month
				FALL				
2	19	16.5	3.4	21.8	2.6	5.3	3.4	2.1
3	27	7.3	4.5	11.4	2.2	4.1	3.1	1.6
TOTAL	36	11.1	6.1	15.7	5.7	4.6	3.3	1.8
				SPRING				
2	7	18.7	2.3	24.1	1.5	5.4	1.0	3.0
3	28	9.8	3.2	13.8	1.6	4.0	2.1	2.0
TOTAL	35	11.6	4.7	15.8	4.5	4.2	2.0	2.2

APPENDIX A

Results of the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test
Lincoln

Test Level	Number of Students	PRETEST Mean	PRETEST S.D.	POSTTEST Mean	POSTTEST S.D.	MASTERY Mean	MASTERY S.D.	Mean Mastery Per Month
				FALL				
1	3	9.6	3.2	13.3	3.8	3.7	1.1	1.1
2	6	10.8	5.4	19.3	4.2	8.5	4.2	2.2
3	17	9.8	4.3	12.5	2.8	2.7	2.0	0.7
TOTAL	26	10.0	4.3	14.2	4.3	4.1	3.5	1.1
				SPRING				
1	3	14.3	3.8	21.7	4.0	7.3	0.6	4.3
2	5	15.6	5.0	22.0	4.5	6.4	0.9	3.8
3	11	7.9	3.4	13.1	2.3	5.2	1.5	3.0
TOTAL	19	10.9	5.2	16.8	5.4	5.8	1.5	3.4

APPENDIX A

Results of the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test
Madison

Test Level	Number of Students	PRETEST Mean	PRETEST S.D.	POSTTEST Mean	POSTTEST S.D.	MASTERY Mean	MASTERY S.D.	Mean Mastery Per Month
				FALL				
1	1	9.0	0.0	17.0	.0	8.0	.0	3.5
2	4	8.5	2.5	16.5	1.3	8.0	2.2	3.0
3	7	11.7	2.4	13.4	1.6	1.7	.9	0.7
TOTAL	12	10.4	2.7	14.7	2.1	4.3	3.5	1.7
				SPRING				
1	1	18.0	0.0	24.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.3
2	8	14.4	4.1	21.6	3.5	7.2	0.9	3.8
3	13	7.1	2.1	13.2	1.7	6.5	1.0	3.8
TOTAL	22	10.3	4.8	16.8	5.0	6.5	1.0	3.8

APPENDIX A

Results of the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test
F.D.R.

Test Level	Number of Students	PRETEST Mean	PRETEST S.D.	POSTTEST Mean	POSTTEST S.D.	MASTERY Mean	MASTERY S.D.	Mean Mastery Per Month
				FALL				
1	4	16.7	3.7	19.0	4.9	2.2	1.3	1.0
2	18	18.0	3.0	21.3	2.2	3.3	1.5	1.4
3	19	9.8	3.2	12.4	1.9	2.6	1.9	1.1
TOTAL	41	14.0	5.1	16.9	5.0	2.9	1.7	1.3
				SPRING				
1	2	17.0	4.2	22.5	3.5	5.5	0.7	2.2
2	6	17.0	5.5	23.5	2.7	6.5	2.8	2.5
3	25	7.6	4.8	12.3	2.3	4.7	2.8	2.0
TOTAL	33	9.9	6.3	14.9	5.3	5.0	2.8	2.1

APPENDIX A

Results of the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test
South Shore

Test Level	Number of Students	PRETEST Mean	PRETEST S.D.	POSTTEST Mean	POSTTEST S.D.	MASTERY Mean	MASTERY S.D.	Mean Mastery Per Month
				FALL				
1	2	11.5	2.1	17.5	2.1	6.0	0.0	2.5
2	9	14.9	3.3	20.0	4.2	5.1	2.5	2.2
3	7	8.8	3.5	12.3	2.1	3.4	2.6	1.5
TOTAL	18	12.2	4.3	16.7	4.9	4.5	2.5	1.9
				SPRING				
1	2	11.0	9.9	17.0	9.9	6.0	0.0	2.7
2	3	9.0	7.0	18.7	7.1	9.7	3.5	3.7
3	9	8.2	5.4	12.3	2.5	4.1	3.1	1.6
TOTAL	14	8.8	5.8	14.3	5.2	5.5	3.6	2.2

APPENDIX B

Passing Rates for Computer Literacy

Content Area	FALL Number of Students	FALL Percent Passing	SPRING Number of Students	SPRING Percent Passing	TOTAL Overall Passing Rate
Be'er Hagola[a]	4	100.0	61	98.4	98.5
Harama[b]	18	100.0	18	100.0	100.0
Lincoln[c]	2	100.0	5	80.0	85.7
F.D.R.[a]	47	100.0	51	100.0	100.0
South Shore[a]	20	100.0	17	100.0	100.0
Madison[a]	--	--	2	100.0	100.0
TOTALS	91	100.0	154	98.7	99.2

[a] Includes computer literacy and typing.

[b] Includes typing.

[c] Includes computer literacy and keyboard typing.

APPENDIX C: GUEST SPEAKER PROGRAM

The Computer Focused Russian Bilingual Instructional Program invited representatives of various academic institutions and businesses to speak to students about choosing a college major and/or choosing a career. Guest speakers included:

Mr. Andy Anderson
Barbizon School of Modeling
3 East 54th Street
New York, NY 10022
(212) 371-4300
February 12, 1986 F.D.R. H.S.

Mr. Slava Yasnovsky
International Paper Company
P.O. Box 797
Tuxedo, NY 100987
(914) 351-2101, Ext. 421
March 6, 1986, Madison H.S.

Ms. Lisa Small
Assitant Dean of Admissions
Bramson O.R.T.
44 East 23rd Street
New York, NY 10010
(212) 677-7420
February 15, 1986, Be'er Hagola

Dr. Steven Erde
85 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201
(718) 852-3535
March 22, 1986, Be'er Hagola

Mrs. Eva Kleyman
Department of Home Economics &
Consumer Studies
Brooklyn College
Beford Avenue and Avenue H
Brooklyn, NY 11210
(718) 780-5485/5025
December 4, 1985, Madison H.S.

Mr. Frank McMullen, Director
American Institute of Banking
225 Broadway
New York, NY 10007
(212) 349-8440
December 6, 1985, F.D.R. H.S.

Mr. David S. Michaels
250 Broadway
New York, NY 10007
Abraham Lincoln H.S.

Mr. Ira Jaskoll
Director of Bramson ORT
44 East 23rd Street
New York, NY 10010
Be'er Hagola

APPENDIX D: STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

Monthly workshops were held to hear activity reports by staff members working at the six program sites, and to cover other topics as well. The following list is comprised of the workshops held as of the date of the evaluation.

DATE	MAJOR TOPICS
9/6/85	Plans to review each staff member's assignments and responsibilities
10/15/85	Fall testing Progress report and data collection Identifying seniors at each site who need assistance in choosing careers and colleges
11/18/85	Guest speaker: Misha Gelperin from Russian Adolescent Program Testing Update
12/20/85	Program Update: plan for trips and guest speakers
2/3/86	Spring semester programs Organizing supportive services at all sites Testing procedures Exchange of books among sites
2/24/86	Program goals and objectives Progress of private-school participants Progress in college advisement Post-testing
3/27/86	Russian Native Language Writing Test Resource teachers' reports on parent conferences Tutorial programs at all sites Choices of Russian literature course
5/28/86	Program evaluation College admission survey Post-testing schedule